DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 546 24 SO 000 275

TITLE	Curriculum Materials in Research Methods in Sociology for Law Students. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Denver Univ., Colo. Coll. of Law.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-1236
PUB DATE	69
GRANT	OEG-4-8-061236-0093
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development, *Graduate Study, Institutes (Training Programs), Interdisciplinary Approach, *Law Instruction, Law Schools, Material Development, Program Development, Projects, *Research Methodology, Social Sciences, *Sociology
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado, Denver University

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this project (1966-1969) was to provide law students with a basic understanding of modern sociological inquiry since the importance of sociology to the law has increased with applications ranging from the presentation of evidence in court to the design of programs for legal reform and social change. The general objective here was to develop awareness of the sociological research problems involved in the derivation of testable hypotheses from sociological theory, methods of collecting data, and the analysis of data in quantitative form. Consequently, the curriculum materials were developed stressing methodology but including substantive concerns. These materials consisted of a two volume case book of selected reading, commentary, and accompanying exercises (SO 000 276 and SO 000 277). During the life of the project, several courses concerned with law and social science research were taught at the University of Denver (Appendix C), and a summer institute, "Social Science Methods in Legal Education" or SSMILE, was held in 1967, 1968, and 1969 -- participants, syllabus, and materials are included (Appendix D). In addition, this project has lead to the development of a one and one-half year course in social problems at the University of Denver College of Law. (SBE)

ED043546

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR 6-1236
PA-24
SO

CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN RESEARCH METHODS IN SOCIOLOGY FOR LAW STUDENTS

Prepared Under Grant OEG-4-7-061236-0093,
U.S. Office of Education

FINAL REPORT

I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there have been extensive innovations at almost every level of the educational system in terms of organizational forms, methods of teaching, curriculum materials, and so on. Education at the professional level, however, frequently seems to have been far more bound by tradition, far more resistant to the demands for experimentation and change, than any other part of the system; and, with a few exceptions, professional training in many fields has much the same appearance as it had twenty years ago.

This is particularly true in the area of law--perhaps because as an intellectual enterprise the law has such a respect for precedent. The "case method" of study, introduced by Christopher Langdell at the law school of Harvard University in 1870, was undoubtedly an important and worthwhile innovation in its time, but there are many critics today who would argue that methods of legal instruction have rigidified. So, too, would many critics argue that the content of legal education has

SO 000 275

CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN RESEARCH METHODS IN SOCIOLOGY FOR LAW STUDENTS

Prepared Under Grant OEG-4-7-061236-0093,
U.S. Office of Education

FINAL REPORT

I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there have been extensive innovations at almost every level of the educational system in terms of organizational forms, methods of teaching, curriculum materials, and so on. Education at the professional level, however, frequently seems to have been far more bound by tradition, far more resistant to the demands for experimentation and change, than any other part of the system; and, with a few exceptions, professional training in many fields has much the same appearance as it had twenty years ago.

This is particularly true in the area of law--perhaps because as an intellectual enterprise the law has such a respect for precedent. The "case method" of study, introduced by Christopher Langdell at the law school of Harvard University in 1870, was undoubtedly an important and worthwhile innovation in its time, but there are many critics today who would argue that methods of legal instruction have rigidified. So, too, would many critics argue that the content of legal education has

failed to respond to the realities of a changing society which grows ever more complex.

Clearly, the well trained lawyer must know the basic principles of the legal rules and a great deal of specific, detailed law as well. He must know intricate forms of legal procedure, the rules governing legal evidence, the nature of legal ethics, modes of legal reasoning, and so on. But it is also becoming clear that the role of the lawyer is changing now and will change even more in the future; and the social system in which his knowledge of the law must be applied is in the process of being radically transformed. If the lawyer is to function effectively in new roles in a changing society, his training must be broadened to include a much greater emphasis on understanding the social context in which his special skills are exercised.

The College of Law of the University of Denver has long had a special interest in the contribution that sociology could make to this task; and this project--Grant Number OEG-4-7-061236-0093--represents an effort to develop curriculum materials joining law and the social sciences.

II

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

In planning this project, we did not wish to turn law students into budding sociologists, nor were we merely interested in widening

the intellectual scope of the law student's training--although the latter would be valuable. Instead, our main purpose was to provide law students with a basic understanding of modern sociological inquiry so that they would be better equipped for their professional work as lawyers --as practicing attorneys, legal policy makers, and legal scholars. The importance of sociology to the law is increasing, with applications ranging from the presentation of evidence in court to the design of programs for legal reform. It is imperative that lawyers be prepared to make intelligent, informed evaluations of sociological data; and, in order to do this, the lawyer needs a sound knowledge of the research methods by which sociological data are obtained. Our purpose, then, was to produce sophisticated consumers of sociology within the legal profession, rather than persons trained to make a career of original research in the social sciences.

Sociology has grown rapidly over the last twenty years as a scientific discipline and is being used with increasing frequency in a variety of fields. As a consequence, people trained in a number of professions other than sociology (such as law, medicine, and education) are often required to make judgments about sociological data, evaluating their worth and making decisions about their application. However, in making these judgments--as practitioners, teachers, members of voluntary associations, government officials, and so on--these professionals often find themselves with an inadequate knowledge of

sociology and its methodology. They may have had some courses in sociology as undergraduates, but unfortunately these courses seldom provide the background necessary for an informed judgment about empirical research, its possible value, and its limitations. Yet a knowledge of the research methods of sociology is essential, if sociological findings are to be employed wisely rather than accepted or rejected wholesale.

This problem is particularly acute for the lawyer since the law and the social sciences touch at so many different points and closer bonds are clearly in the making. In recent years, for example, the law has shown an increased interest in the use of sociology in areas such as trademark infringement, change of venue, discrimination, common usage in contract disputes, and community standards of fitness for citizenship. The practicing lawyer has drawn on the social sciences for information in cases involving the plea of insanity, the perceptive powers of witnesses, labor-management disputes, and the interpretation of statutes and legal documents. The legal policy maker has used the social sciences in dealing with problems such as delay in the courts, medical testimony, the selection of juries, providing counsel to the indigent, and releasing criminal defendants without bail pending trial. And the legal scholar has made increasing use of the social sciences in the analysis of the impact of public opinion on the legal system, the role of pressure groups, the decisions of judges, the impact of contract law on business practice, and so on.

In this growing use of sociology by the law, it is clear that the lawyer must be in a position to weigh the findings of sociology with a critical eye. There is always the danger that as the materials of one discipline are put to use by another, the qualifications and limitations of the materials will be ignored or misunderstood and that tentative conclusions will be accepted as demonstrated. Or, the materials may be rejected and their potential contribution lost, due to a lack of understanding of their empirical research base. If, then, the social sciences are to be used well, if sociology is to become a viable part of legal thought and usage, it is necessary to train law students in research methods as well as to familiarize them with the substantive content of the field. The validity of sociological findings often depends on matters of sampling procedures, interviewing techniques, questionnaire construction, the use and misuse of statistics, control groups, and other aspects of research methodology. A knowledge of these methods forms an indispensable tool and we made the decision that the development of curriculum materials stressing methodology should take precedence over more substantive concerns.

Our aim, however, was not to produce students trained in a limited set of techniques. Instead, our general objective was to develop in law students an awareness of the problems involved in the derivation of testable hypotheses from sociological theory, methods of collecting data, and the analysis of data in quantitative form. The ability to construct

a two-by-two table and to calculate Chi-square, for example, can be regarded as technical skills and useful ones. But it is no less important for the law student to have grasped the general concept of tests of significance, their appropriate and inappropriate applications, and the conclusions which can be derived from them.

A student in law school cannot be expected to become highly skilled as a researcher in sociology. He can, however acquire the knowledge he needs for a sound evaluation of sociological research and its application. What are the assumptions and theoretical underpinnings of the propositions in question? Is the research design adequate? What limitations must be placed on generalizing from the facts observed to a larger universe? Do the methods of collecting data give valid results? If statistical methods are used, are they appropriate? Do the research findings warrant a program of action? These are the kinds of questions the lawyer is increasingly called on to answer, whether he is dealing with evidence of discrimination in a court trial, a proposed revision of the criminal code, a study of mass communications, or the administration of justice.

Our general objective, then, was to provide law students with a background for answering such questions, to equip them with the critical ability to handle sociological research in their professional capacity as lawyers.

The project began in the fall of 1966, with Professor Gresham M.

Sykes as Director and Assistant Professor Norman K. Linton as Associate Director. In collaboration with other members of the law faculty, the faculty of the Sociology Department of the University of Denver, graduate student assistants, and outside consultants, we began to survey both the sociological and legal literature to assemble readings which would provide a clear exposition of methodology and an analysis of important legal issues illuminating the use of sociological research methods. The sociological literature concerning methodology is vast. Our major problem was to find those readings which we thought would be geared both to the interests and abilities of law students. The legal literature in which social science research is used is smaller, relatively speaking, and the issue here was to find those readings covering methodological points which would be within the scope of the law student's developing skills. (Academic writing which joins law and social science is a rapidly growing field and it expanded greatly while our project was in progress.) In addition, we began to collect a limited number of empirical studies using quantitative data for which cards, code books, and so on were available.

In 1966-1967, we prepared and taught a preliminary course in methodology for law students, as well as a course in Law and Society exploring some of the major issues joining law and the social sciences. Both of these first attempts were inadequate, in our opinion, but for somewhat different reasons. The course in methods included too much statistical methodology which proved to be beyond the ability of our law

students to handle. Their mathematical background was insufficient (or our teaching ability was not good enough) for an adequate understanding of concepts relating to sampling, correlation, and the testing of a null hypothesis. The course in Law and Society proved to be much too closely geared to the disciplinary interests of sociologists and with insufficient attention paid to the developing professional interests of law students.

By the year 1967-1968, we had managed to gather better selections from the sociological literature on methodology and its application to legal issues. We had eliminated a number of unnecessary complications in the readings in statistics and our ability to present the essential ideas to law students had, we hoped, improved. (The constant problem we faced was presenting relatively simple ideas from one field to students becoming relatively sophisticated in another, which is not as easy a task as it might appear.) In addition, the awareness or understanding of both the teachers and the students participating in the project, with regard to the important connections between law and the social sciences, began to change. I will return to this issue shortly, but at the moment it is enough to point out that projects such as these do not take place in an historical vacuum. The project was conceived in 1965; it was finished in 1969; and the course of the project was materially affected by changes taking place in the society-at-large, the composition of the student body, and the intellectual viewpoint of the staff.

In 1968-1969, the place of Professor Linton was taken by Professor Robert Sulnick who has been trained in the social sciences as well as being a professor of law. The course materials in methodology were brought to a final form; and the case book, consisting of two volumes of selected readings, commentary, and accompanying exercises was completed. (See Appendix A.) The materials have been mimeographed and assembled in some 200 copies and distributed to selected teachers at law schools throughout the country. (See Appendix B.) During the life of the project, courses concerned with law and social science research have been taught at the College of Law, University of Denver, involving some 263 students. (See Appendix C.)

In addition, the curriculum materials developed in the project have been used in two other situations. First, a course in social science research methodology was taught at the University of California at Los Angeles Law School by Professor Arthur Rosett, with the assistance of Professor Miriam Morris, in the spring of 1969, as part of our effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the materials (we will comment on his experience later). And second, the materials were used in the summers of 1967, 1968, and 1969 as part of the University of Denver's College of Law program for training law professors throughout the United States in the methods of sociological research. This program--or institute, as it is called--with the happy acronym of SSMILE (Social Science Methods in Legal Education), is directed by Dean Robert Yegge, funded by the

University of Denver College of Law, the Walter E. Meyer Research Institute of Law, and the Russell Sage Foundation, and sponsored by the Association of American Law Schools and the Law and Society Association. A total of 57 law professors have attended the four-week institute in the three-year period and the curriculum materials formed an important component of the instruction. (See Appendix D.)

III

COMMENTS

The desire for the evaluation of new educational materials is readily understandable, since such materials are designed to do an old job better than before or to perform a new job, and we need to make a judgment about their effectiveness before proceeding with them. There are, however, a number of barriers to evaluation in the educational field, in our opinion, which need to be recognized. First, the most important outcomes are often long-range and are not to be detected easily in immediate testing. Second, the criteria of effectiveness are frequently difficult to measure precisely--or to measure at all, in a rigorous sense--and to seize on something that <u>can</u> be measured may be no more than a facile distortion. And third, whatever the impact of an educational innovation may be, it is quite possible that it will be obscured or confounded by other factors that come into play, unless precise controls are available--and this is only sometimes possible. In short, despite the need for good

rigorous evaluation, it is often not obtainable; and the substitution of easy but irrelevant figures is a disservice.

With these considerations in mind, we have labelled our impressions of the outcome of the project "comments" rather than "evaluation," to underline their provisional and imperfect nature.

On the whole, we think we were fairly successful in accomplishing what we set out to do; but that rather reserved judgment should be subject to more explicit reservations.

First, as it now stands, the case book of readings, commentary, and exercises is marked by a considerable diversity of style, disciplinary jargon, format, etc. This might be expected, since it represents an effort to join a number of fields each accustomed to its own peculiar usages. None the less, it appears to be a troublesome factor for law students; and this was particularly remarked by Professor Rosett in describing his experience with the material at the University of California at Los Angeles. We ourselves doubt that this difficulty can be overcome very easily and are inclined to mark it down, for the moment, as one of the inherent problems of interdisciplinary work. It is possible, of course, that all the material could be rewritten by one person, to assure greater uniformity, but the outcome of such an effort does not seem to warrant the expenditure of time and money that would be involved.

Second, our experience with these materials strongly suggest that a law professor, by himself, would encounter considerable difficulty in their presentation, unless he had had previous exposure to social science research methods. The same conclusion was expressed by Professor Rosett. However, both in teaching these materials at the College of Law, University of Denver, and the UCLA Law School, team teaching was employed at least in part, in the sense that a sociologist as well as a law professor often took an active part in classroom discussion. Until such time as law professors are more completely trained in the social sciences or sociologists are more completely trained in the law, we think some sort of team teaching for such materials is much the best approach. This is something that goes beyond a mere matter of professional expertise--it involves the self-conscious joining of two very different intellectual traditions, often in an atmosphere of skepticism and sharp criticism. The give-and-take between two teachers from quite different disciplines who are often at odds can be one of the enlightening features of such cross-disciplinary efforts. As we quickly found out in using our materials, there is a vast body of unspoken assumptions, sense of intellectual priorities, folk wisdom of the discipline, and so on, which cannot be captured on the written page. It requires a man who has worked with or lived in a discipline; and the single teacher finds it very difficult to illuminate two disciplines, despite the best intentions in the world or even long familiarity.

Third, the readings we finally selected as illustrating the joining of law and the social sciences with a particular emphasis on methodological issues, are not, in our opinion, the best that can be found on the cutting edge where the two disciplines are used together. When we first conceived this project, in 1965, the three types of cross-disciplinary efforts we mentioned at the beginning of this report were indeed the ones that were most important at the time. The use of social science data in court, the formation of public policy in areas such as criminal procedures, and academic research loomed large. Since that time, however, there has been a crucial shift. The conception of the lawyer's role in society has begun to undergo a major transformation and in that process his need for certain kinds of information from the social sciences has changed. What has happened is that lawyers--or at least some lawyers, the ones we are most interested in--have begun to play a far larger, more active part in extensive programs of social reform. Lawyers no longer confine themselves to their traditional role of representing business interests. They no longer deal with criminal matters within a static system of unquestioned rules. They no longer ape the cloistered academician and pursue pure knowledge as a self-sufficient goal. Lawyers, in short, have become activists, particularly younger lawyers, tyro lawyers, who reflect the changing student mood of the sixties. And as these lawyers (and law students) have become more and more involved with a wide variety of social problems, the contribution that the social sciences can make to the

work of the law has become far more diverse and complicated. Problems of environmental pollution, the participation of the poor in community programs, militant minority groups, control of the military, consumer protection, public access to governmental information, the use of the mass media in the public interest--all require data from the social sciences far different from what the law looked for in the past. The most important difference is that the information needed is no longer the isolated fact torn from its context, a narrow slice of data cut to fit the law's concept of evidence, or a neat, numerical conclusion satisfying the law's view of what science looks like. Instead, the information is often more theoretical, more diffuse, more infused with values, more oriented to future possibilities than present realities. And, most importantly, the information often involves the social setting in which the law must operate rather than the details of the law's operation itself.

All this means that what we used to talk about as the union of law and the social sciences isn't what it used to be and we would change a number of our illustrations a second time around. A knowledge of the facts needed to support an allegation of trademark infringement, for example, and a knowledge of the methodology by which those facts are obtained and validated, no longer seems to pose quite the intellectual challenge that it once did. Now, questions about the social consequences of urban renewal or the legal implications of incorporating ghetto residents as a part of a Model City Program are far more absorbing. The

concept of an appropriate methodology to gather the data for answers to such questions is not so very different from what it used to be in the past, although the emphasis on attitude surveys has probably declined. But the reason for being concerned with methodology, the motivation for its study has altered; and this almost certainly entails a change in the way these curriculum materials are best used in the law school.

When we began this project, we believed that law students could become interested in social science research methodology, partly on the grounds that we would be successful in showing them the relevance of social science data for the law and partly on the grounds that we could make the study of methodology intellectually challenging and stimulating enough to capture student enthusiasm. We believe we managed to do both of these things; but we were also overtaken by the rush of events in the society-at-large which became reflected in law students, as we have indicated. The very students who are most drawn to innovations in the law-school curriculum, who are most dissatisfied with the limitations of the case study method and the analysis of appellate decisions, are also likely to be those students who are pressing hardest for social reform. They are willing to study social science research methods, but mainly as a tool to a particular end and not as another form of an intellectual chess game.

I do not think we quite came to grips with their needs and interests.

The students at the College of Law of the University of Denver who went through our versions of the course in methodology worked hard, learned a good deal that they would not normally pick up in a law school, became a good bit more sophisticated about the basis of social science data, and gained a much greater understanding of how law and the social sciences had been used together in the past. But their eyes were often fixed on the future, on changing that future; and we did not go far enough, in our opinion, in showing them how the study of methodology could help them toward that goal.

The criticisms of the outcome of our project on curriculum materials sketched in above do not mean that we are unhappy with the results of our work. They are intended, rather, as a frank appraisal of what we have been able to accomplish and as a guideline for where we should go next. Certainly, a great many of the law professors who used the materials in SSMILE were enthusiastic about them and indicated their intention of using them in whole or in part at their home institutions --and one of our major objectives had been to make law schools throughout the country more aware of and more receptive to the methodological aspects of the social sciences. We have received numerous letters from law professors at a variety of institutions to whom we sent a copy of the case book and it is apparent that it is meeting a real need and generating greater interest in joint efforts between law and the social sciences. And the project itself--its staff, its associated students, its involvement with

faculty--has been a source of important intellectual stimulation at the University of Denver College of Law. "The most significant achievement of the University of Denver College of Law," notes a report of the Accreditation Committee of the American Bar Association "has been its development of a comprehensive program in teaching the relationship of law and the social sciences and carrying out empirical research in the law . . . ." We believe that this project, undertaken with the aid of a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, has been an invaluable source of innovations in the University of Denver College of Law.

IV

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

It seems to us that as closer bonds between law and the social sciences continue to develop, as they show every indication of doing, there will be a growing need for methodological sophistication on the part of lawyers and some form of teaching methodology in law schools. The basic premise, in other words, on which this project was founded remains unchanged. It also seems to us that the case book we have prepared is a good beginning in the development of the necessary curriculum materials, although it will undoubtedly be revised as it is used in teaching.

However, if the teaching of social science research methods is to become a viable part of the law school curriculum and not merely an exotic

sort of interest that flourishes for a time and then withers away, we are convinced that the materials must be made part of a larger sequence in which there is a strong emphasis on action in the realm of pressing social problems. We are now in the process of developing such a program at the University of Denver College of Law and we think it is worthwhile to look briefly at some of its details.

The program will begin in the spring term of the student's first year in law school with a course in social problems. The materials for this course, developed in conjunction with the curriculum project's work on social science methods of research, will cover seven major institutional areas: the structure of the community, including relationships to the physical environment; the family; the educational system; the production of goods and services; the distribution of goods and services; the political system; and what can be called meaning and motivation, which includes the study of basic social values, alienation, and so on. In this course we will examine the social problems to be found in each of the major social institutions and the associated legal issues. The list of topics to be examined will include such matters as metropolitan land use, the control of pollution, divorce, school desegregation, the use of the mass media, and so on.

In the law student's second year, he will begin with a course in legal remedies, exploring the advantages and disadvantages of civil suits, criminal procedures, injunctions, writs, legislation, group actions, etc.,

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

as possible solutions. The study of remedies, centering on the question of how to help solve social problems rather than individual complaints, will also include quasi-legal devices or solutions that are outside the traditional, formal boundaries of the law but which have important legal underpinnings, such as the formation of resident corporations in ghetto areas, the use of the mass media for the mobilization of public opinion, and broadened political participation.

As a part of the program in the second year and running parallel to the student's study of remedies, there will be a sequence of seminars in which: (a) students select a major social problem and analyze it intensively; (b) design an appropriate legal and/or quasi-legal remedy; and (c) evaluate current research on the problem and carry out original research where necessary. It is in this last phase that we will use the curriculum materials we have developed in this project, examining methodology not in the abstract or as an isolated subject, but as a means to an immediate end which the student has chosen for himself.

For those students in the program (and we estimate that we can handle about 20 to 25 students, if we can find some additional financial support), the third year's work will consist of applying their studies, of attempting to use the remedy or set of remedies they have developed with the supervision of the faculty members participating in the program. This may take the form of litigation, the writing of legislation and securing of

political support, the formation of new social organizations, participation in existing official agencies, etc. It should be pointed out that the College of Law of the University of Denver is now creating one of the most extensive clinical programs for law students in the country; and that program can, in many instances, be used as a vehicle for the application of the knowledge and skills acquired in the sequence of courses sketched in above.

V

CONCLUSIONS

Legal education, like many other forms of professional education, is responding to the rush of social change which is modifying our society. The pace of response has been faster at some law schools than at others, but there are probably none that can escape the complex and difficult task of reappraising the purpose of a legal education and the best means of obtaining it.

One of the most important shifts taking place, in our opinion, involves far greater attention to the social context in which legal rules are used, both influencing that context and being influenced by it, as opposed to a hermetic concern with the logical structure of the rules alone. As this shift occurs, the lawyer and the law student cannot avoid questioning the consequences of the law with which he deals. He cannot ignore the empirical regularities of human behavior or the nature of the scientific

methods by which information concerning these regularities is obtained.

This project has been a preliminary effort to develop some of the curriculum materials which law schools will unquestionably require in the years ahead. But we have been made all too aware that curriculum materials cannot be developed in intellectual isolation and that we must constantly pay attention to the changing conceptions of the professions. We hope that the larger sequence we have designed will answer some of these difficulties and make our materials on methods still more useful.

Gresham M. Sykes, Director
Administration of Justice Program
College of Law
University of Denver

APPENDIX A

LAW AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH:

A Collection of Annotated Readings

By

Gresham M. Sykes
Robert H. Sulnick
Norman K. Linton

APPENDIX B

Distribution of Curriculum Project Case Book

Professor Robert Adman
University of Akron College of Law
Akron, Ohio 44304

Professor John D. Ayer
University of California School of Law
Davis, California 95616

Dean Charles E. Ares
University of Arizona College of Law
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Professor David C. Baldus
The University of Iowa College of Law
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Professor Robert Bard
University of Connecticut Law School
1800 Asylum
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

Professor Francis E. Barkman
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Dean Edward Barrett
University of California School of Law
Davis, California 95616

Professor Allen H. Barton, Director
Bureau of Applied Research
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor William M. Beaney
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

Professor Herbert N. Bernhardt
Northeastern University School of Law
104 The Fenway
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Professor Richard J. Bonnie
University of Virginia School of Law
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Professor Spencer H. Boyer
Howard University School of Law
Washington, D. C. 20001

Professor Lester Brickman, Director
Law and Poverty Project
University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor Albert Broderick
The Catholic University of America School of Law
Washington, D. C. 20017

Professor Patrick Brown
University of Florida College of Law
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Professor David Caplovitz
Department of Sociology
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Dean Thomas W. Christopher
University of New Mexico School of Law
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Professor Alfred Coco
University of Houston College of Law
Houston, Texas 77004

Professor Fred Cohen
University of Texas School of Law
Austin, Texas 78705

Professor Alfred F. Conard
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Professor John E. Coons
University of California School of Law
Berkeley, California 94720

Professor Charles H. Cottingham
Rutgers, The State University, School of Law
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Miss Jill Cottrell
108 Dwight Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Professor Alan D. Cullison
University of Houston College of Law
3801 Cullen Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77004

Professor Robert O. Dawson
The University of Texas at Austin College of Law
2500 Red River
Austin, Texas 78705

Professor Richard T. Dole
University of Iowa College of Law
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Professor Robert H. Dreher
Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dean Robert F. Drinan
Boston College Law School
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Professor David E. Engdahl, Director
The Law Revision Center
University of Colorado School of Law
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Professor William Evan
Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Professor Lionel Frankel
University of Utah College of Law
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Professor David Franks
Department of Sociology
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Professor Lawrence M. Friedman
Stanford University Law School
Stanford, California 94305

Professor Jaime B. Fuster
University of Puerto Rico School of Law
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

Professor Alvin L. Goldman
University of Kentucky College of Law
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Dean John G. Graham
Rutgers, The State University, School of Law
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor Frederic S. Gray
6 Derby House
200 West Galbraith Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45215

Professor Brian A. Grosman
McGill University
Chancellor Day Hall
3644 Peel Street
Montreal 112, Quebec, Canada

Professor Dov M. Grunschlag
University of California School of Law
Davis, California 95616

Professor Daniel S. Guy
Ohio Northern University College of Law
Ada, Ohio 45810

Professor Joel F. Handler
University of Wisconsin Law School
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dean Paul P. Harbrecht
University of Detroit School of Law
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Professor Clark C. Havighurst
Duke University School of Law
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.
University of Chicago Law School
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Professor N. William Hines
University of Iowa College of Law
Iowa City, Iowa 52204

Professor Robert C. Hunter
886 Hereford Drive
Akron, Ohio 44303

Professor Eli Jarmel
Rutgers, The State University, School of Law
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor Harry W. Jones
Columbia University School of Law
New York, New York 10027

Professor John M. Junker
University of Washington School of Law
Seattle, Washington 98105

Professor Harry Kalven, Jr.
University of Chicago Law School
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Professor Michael P. Katz
University of North Carolina School of Law
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. M. Frances Kelly
Assistant to the Dean
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Professor Charles D. Kelso
Indiana University Law School
102 West Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dr. William H. Key, Chairman
Department of Sociology
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Professor Nicholas N. Kittrie
Washington College of Law
The American University
Massachusetts & Nebraska Avenues, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Professor Ramon A. Klitzke
Institute on Poverty and the Law
Marquette University
1103 West Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Dean Karl Krastin
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor Sam Krislov
Department of Political Science
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Professor Jack Ladinsky
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Professor Eliot A. Landau
Drake University Law School
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Professor Norvie L. Lay
University of Louisville School of Law
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

Professor Martin Levine
University of Southern California Law Center
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007

Professor Graham C. Lilly
University of Virginia School of Law
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Mr. Norman K. Linton
Evergreen, Colorado

Professor Neil O. Littlefield
University of Connecticut School of Law
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

Professor Bartlett H. McGuire
University of Pittsburgh School of Law
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dean Robert B. McKay
New York University School of Law
New York, New York 10003

Professor Ian R. MacNeil
Cornell Law School
Ithaca, New York 14850

Professor Wex S. Malone
Louisiana State University Law School
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Professor Daniel R. Mandelker
Washington University School of Law
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Professor Fredric R. Merrill
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Roy M. Mersky
The University of Texas System School of Law
The Law Library
2500 Red River
Austin, Texas 78705

Dr. Sheldon Messinger
Center for the Study of Law and Society
University of California
Berkeley, California

Professor Perry Meyer
McGill University
3644 Peel Street
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Professor Frank I. Michelman
Harvard University School of Law
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Professor John Mixon
University of Houston College of Law
Cullen Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77004

Professor Robert C. L. Moffat
University of Florida College of Law
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Professor Denton R. Moore
Drake University Law School
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Professor Miriam Morris
School of Public Health
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Professor Webster Myers, Jr.
University of South Carolina School of Law
1515 Green Street
Columbia, South Carolina

Professor Stuart S. Nagel
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Dean Leo J. O'Brien
Loyola Law School
1440 West 9th Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Professor Lloyd Ohlin
Harvard University Law School
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Professor Raymond I. Parnas
University of Arkansas School of Law
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Dean Willard H. Pedrick
Arizona State University College of Law
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Professor J. Timothy Philipps
West Virginia University College of Law
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Professor Walter Probert
University of Florida College of Law
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Professor John Daniel Reaves
University of Georgia School of Law
Athens, Georgia 30601

Professor R. H. Richards
Walter F. George School of Law
Mercer University
Macon, Georgia 31207

Professor Maurice Rosenberg
Columbia University School of Law
New York, New York 10027

Professor Arthur Rosett
University of California College of Law
Los Angeles, California

Professor Millard H. Rudd
University of Texas School of Law
Austin, Texas 78705

Professor Irvin C. Rutter
University of Cincinnati College of Law
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Dr. Karl Schuessler
Department of Sociology
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Professor Richard D. Schwartz
Northwestern University School of Law
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Professor Herbert Semmel
University of Illinois College of Law
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Professor Thomas L. Shaffer
Notre Dame Law School
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Professor Philip Shuchman
Indiana University School of Law
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Professor L. Orin Slagle, Jr.
The Ohio State University College of Law
1659 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Professor W. David Slawson
University of Southern California Law Center
Los Angeles, California 90007

Professor Allen E. Smith
The University of Texas at Austin College of Law
2500 Red River
Austin, Texas

Professor J. Allen Smith
Rutgers, The State University, School of Law
180 Plane Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor John A. Spanogle, Jr.
University of Maine School of Law
Portland, Maine 04101

Professor Thomas H. Sponsler
Loyola University School of Law
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Professor James E. Starrs
Rutgers, The State University, School of Law
180 Plane Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor Robert A. Stein
University of Minnesota Law School
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Professor Robert H. Sulnick
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Justin Sweet
University of California School of Law
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. Gresham M. Sykes, Director
Administration of Justice Program
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor A. Dan Tarlock
Indiana University School of Law
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Professor William H. Traylor, Director
Emory Community Legal Services Center
1397 Oxford Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30307

Professor Dr. P. Vinke
Wergroep Rechtssociologie
Rijksunivesiteit Te Leiden
Leiden, Holland

Professor Timothy B. Walker
McGeorge School of Law
University of the Pacific
Sacramento, California 95817

Professor James J. White
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Professor Thomas E. Willging
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor John M. Winters
University of San Diego School of Law
Alcala Park
San Diego, California 92110

Dean Harold G. Wren
Northwestern School of Law of Lewis & Clark College
0615 South West Palatine Hill Road
Portland, Oregon 97219

Dean Robert B. Yegge
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Martha S. Yerkes
Loyola University School of Law
1440 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Professor Hans Zeisel
University of Chicago Law School
Chicago, Illinois 60637

APPENDIX C

University of Denver Law School

Courses Concerned with Law and Social Science

1966 - 1969

COURSES	QUARTER	ENROLLMENT
Law and Society	Fall 1966	23
Seminar in Law & Social Science Research	Winter 1967	3
Criminal Justice Seminar	Spring 1967	9
Legal Practice Seminar	Spring 1967	10
Law in Transition	Fall 1967	10
Social Legal Research Seminar	Fall 1967	8
Legal Practice Seminar	Fall 1967	19
Law and Society	Winter 1968	5
Negotiation Seminar	Winter 1968	14
Social Legal Research Seminar	Winter 1968	1
Law and Morality	Spring 1968	8
Social Legal Research Seminar	Spring 1968	7
Law in Transition	Summer 1968	11
Seminar in Criminal Law	Summer 1968	9
Criminal Justice Seminar	Fall 1968	13

COURSES	QUARTER	ENROLLMENT
Law in Transition	Fall 1968	10
Social Legal Research Seminar	Fall 1968	2
Criminal Justice Seminar	Winter 1969	11
Law and Morality	Winter 1969	7
Social Legal Research Seminar	Winter 1969	4
Criminal Justice Seminar	Spring 1969	8
Law in Transition	Spring 1969	41
Law and Society	Spring 1969	6
Social Legal Research Seminar	Spring 1969	7
Negotiation Seminar	Summer 1969	4
Law and Society	Fall 1969	3
Criminology Seminar	Fall 1969	16
	TOTAL	263

APPENDIX D

Social Science Methods in Legal Education Institute

Faculty of SSMILE

Professor Allen H. Barton
Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University

Professor William Beaney
University of Denver College of Law

Professor Lawrence M. Friedman
Stanford University Law School

Professor Harry Kalven
University of Chicago Law School

Professor Maurice Rosenberg
Columbia University School of Law

Professor Jerome Skolnick
University of California at Berkeley Law School

Dr. Stanton Wheeler
Yale Law School

Participants of SSMILE

Professor Saul W. Baernstein
Southern Methodist University School of Law
Dallas, Texas 75222

Professor Francis E. Barkman
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor Herbert N. Bernhardt
Northeastern University School of Law
104 The Fenway
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Professor Spencer H. Boyer
Howard University School of Law
Washington, D. C. 20001

Professor Lester Brickman, Director
Law and Poverty Project
University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor Patrick Brown
University of Florida College of Law
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Professor Charles H. Cottingham
School of Law - Newark
Rutgers, The State University
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Miss Jill Cottrell
108 Dwight Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Professor Alan D. Cullison
University of Houston College of Law
3801 Cullen Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77004

Professor Richard F. Dole
University of Iowa College of Law
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Professor Robert A. Prentice
Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, & Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Professor David E. Engdahl, Director
The Law Revision Center
University of Colorado School of Law
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Professor Lionel Frankel
College of Law
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Professor Jaime B. Fuster
University of Puerto Rico School of Law
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

Professor Alvin L. Goldman
University of Kentucky College of Law
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Dean John G. Graham
School of Law - Newark
Rutgers, The State University
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor Brian A. Grosman
McGill University
Chancellor Day Hall
3644 Peel Street
Montreal 112, Quebec, Canada

Professor Dov M. Grunschlag
University of California School of Law
Davis, California 95616

Professor Daniel S. Guy
Ohio Northern University College of Law
Ada, Ohio 45810

Professor N. William Hines
University of Iowa College of Law
Iowa City, Iowa 52204

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

Professor T. G. Ison
Columbia University School of Law
New York, New York 10027

Professor Eli Jarmel
School of Law
Rutgers State University
180 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor John M. Junker
University of Washington School of Law
Seattle, Washington 98105

Professor Michael P. Katz
School of Law
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Professor Nicholas N. Kittrie
Washington College of Law
The American University
Massachusetts & Nebraska Aves., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Professor Ramon A. Klitzke
Institute on Poverty and the Law
Marquette University
1103 West Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Dean Karl Krastin
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor Norvie L. Lay
University of Louisville School of Law
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

Professor Graham C. Lilly
University of Virginia School of Law
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Professor Neil O. Littlefield
University of Connecticut School of Law
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

Professor Fredric R. Merrill
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Perry Meyer
McGill University
3644 Peel Street
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Professor Frank I. Michelman
Harvard University Law School
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Professor Robert C. L. Moffat
University of Florida College of Law
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Professor Denton R. Moore
Drake University Law School
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Professor Webster Myers, Jr.
University of South Carolina School of Law
1515 Green Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Professor Ved P. Nanda
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor James Nathanson
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Raymond I. Parnas
University of Arkansas School of Law
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Professor J. Timothy Philipps
West Virginia University College of Law
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Professor John Daniel Reaves
University of Georgia School of Law
Athens, Georgia 30601

Professor Herbert Semmel
University of Illinois College of Law
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Professor Thomas L. Shaffer
Notre Dame Law School
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Professor Philip Shuchman
Indiana University School of Law
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Professor L. Orin Slagle, Jr.
The Ohio State University College of Law
1659 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Professor Ralph Slovenko
University of Kansas School of Law
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Professor J. Allen Smith
School of Law
Rutgers, The State University
180 Plane Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Professor John A. Spanogle, Jr.
University of Maine School of Law
Portland, Maine 04101

Professor James E. Starrs
The George Washington University School of Law
Washington, D. C. 20006

Professor Robert A. Stein
University of Minnesota Law School
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Professor Justin Sweet
University of California School of Law
Berkeley, California 94720

Professor Robert H. Sulnick
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

Professor Dr. P. Vinke
Werkgroep Rechtssociologie
Rijksunivesiteit Te Leiden
Leiden, Holland

Professor James J. White
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Professor Thomas E. Willging
The University of Toledo College of Law
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Professor John M. Winters
University of San Diego School of Law
Alcala Park
San Diego, California 92110

Professor Martha S. Yerkes
Loyola University School of Law
1440 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

SSMILE BOOK INVENTORY

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Han
I.Methods and Concepts				
Howard S. Becker	Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation	Reprinted from Amer.Sociological Review	1958	3
Hubert M. Blalock	Social Statistics	McGraw-Hill	1960	1
Peter M. Blau	The Dynamics of Bureaucracy	Univ. of Chicago Press	1955	1
Allen H. Barton Paul Lazarfeld	Some Functions of Qualitative Analysis in Social Research	Bobbs-Merrill	S-336	3
Donald T. Campbell Keith N. Clayton	Avoiding Regression Effects in Panel Studies	Bobbs-Merrill	S-353	6
Donald T. Campbell Donald W. Fiske	Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix	Bobbs-Merrill	S-354	4
James A. Davis et. al.	A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition	Bobbs-Merrill	S-367	3
LaMar T. Empey Jerome Rabow	The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation	Bobbs-Merrill	S-385	3
Paul F. Lazarfeld	Evidence and Inference In Social Research	Bobbs-Merrill	S-441	2
Paul F. Lazarfeld	The Controversy Over Detailed Interviews	Bobbs-Merrill	S-442	2
Paul F. Lazarfeld	The Use of Panels in Social Research	Bobbs-Merrill	S-443	3
Robert K. Merton Patricia L. Kendall	The Focused Interview	Bobbs-Merrill	S-467	3
W. S. Robinson	Ecological Correlations and The Behavior of Individuals	Bobbs-Merrill	RS-243	3
W. S. Robinson	The Logical Structure of Analytic Induction	Bobbs-Merrill	S-489	3
S. S. Stevens	On the Theory of Scales of Measurement	Bobbs-Merrill	S-515	8
Morris Zelditch	Some Methodological Problems in Field Studies	Bobbs-Merrill	S-545	3

SSMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
Bureau of Applied Research	A Report of the Years 1966 & 1967	Columbia U. Press	1968	4
Donald T. Campbell Julian C. Stanley	Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research	Rand McNally	1966	10
Elie A. Cohen	Human Behavior in The Concentration Camp	W. W. Norton and Co.	1953	1
Thomas B. Curtis	The House Committee on Ways and Means: Congress Seen Through a Key Committee	University of Wisconsin	1966	1
Daniel J. Dykstra	The History of a Legislative Power Struggle	University of Wisconsin	1966	1
Kai T. Erikson	Wayward Puritans	John Wiley and Sons	1966	2
Amitai Etzioni	Complex Organizations	Holt, Rinehart and Winston	1961	9
William M. Evan	Law and Sociology	The Free Press of Glencoe	1962	3
Leon Festinger Daniel Katz	Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences	Holt, Rinehart and Winston	1966	3
Lawrence M. Friedman	On Legalistic Reasoning-- A Footnote to Weber	University of Wisconsin	1966	1
Lawrence M. Friedman	The Law of the Living, The Law of the Dead: Property, Succession, and Society	University of Wisconsin	1966	1
Carl J. Friedrich	Totalitarianism	Harvard University Press	1954	1
Erving Goffman	Asylums	Doubleday-Anchor Press	1961	1
Paul K. Hatt Albert J. Reiss	Reader in Urban Sociology	The Free Press of Glencoe	1951	1
Herbert H. Hyman Charles R. Wright Terence K. Hopkins	Applications of Methods of Evaluation	University of California Press	1962	1
Howard W. Jones	Impact Research and Sociology of Law: Some Tentative Proposals	University of Wisconsin	1966	1

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

SSMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
William A. Klein	The Incidence of the Corporation Income Tax: A Lawyer's View of a Problem in Economics	University of Wisconsin	1965	1
Jack Ladinsky Allan Silver	Popular Democracy and Judicial Independence	University of Wisconsin	1967	1
Paul F. Lazarsfeld Morris Rosenberg	The Language of Social Research	The Free Press	1955	1
Seymour M. Lipset et al.	Union Democracy	Doubleday-Anchor Press	1956	1
James G. March	Handbook of Organizations	Rand, McNally	1965	1
Stuart S. Nagel	Court-Curbing Periods in American History	Reprinted from Vanderbilt Law Review	1965	1
Stuart S. Nagel	Judicial Prediction and Analysis from Empirical Probability Tables	Reprint from Indiana Law Journal	1966	1
Stuart S. Nagel	Testing the Effects of Excluding Illegally Seized Evidence	University of Wisconsin	1965	1
Stuart S. Nagel Robert Erikson	Editorial Reaction to Supreme Court Decisions on Church and State	Princeton University Press	1967	1
Wallace S. Sayre Herbert Kaufman	Governing New York City	Russell Sage Foundation	1960	5
Richard D. Schwartz Sonya Orleans	On Legal Sanctions	University of Chicago	1967	3
Richard D. Schwartz Jerome H. Skolnick	Two Studies of Legal Stigma	Reprinted from Social Problems Fall 1962, Vol. 10, Number 2	1962	4
Claire Sellitz et al.	Research Methods in Social Relations	Holt Rinehart and Winston	1959	2
Samuel A. Stouffer	Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties	Peter Smith Gloucester Mass.	1963	1
Frederic Suffet	Bail Setting: A Study of Courtroom Interaction	National Council on Crime and Delinquency	1966	3
Edwin M. Shur	Law and Society: A Sociological Perspective	Random House	1967	1

SSMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
Gresham Sykes	Ethical Issues in the Behavioral Sciences	Unpublished	1966	3
Gresham Sykes	Legal Needs of the Poor in the City of Denver	Unpublished	1968	6
Eugene J. Webb Donald T. Campbell Richard D. Schwartz Lee Sechrest	Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences	Rand McNally & Co.	1966	2
Frank R. Westie	Toward Closer Relations Between Theory and Research	Amer. Sociological Review, Vol. 2 (2)	1957	3
Hans Zeisel	Say It With Figures	Harper & Row	1957	1
II. Administration of Criminal Justice				
David J. Bordua	The Police: Six Sociological Essays	John Wiley & Sons	1967	2
Donald M. Gillmor	Free Press and Fair Trial	Public Affairs Press	1966	4
The Institute For Defense Analyses	The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society: A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	3
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: The Police	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	5
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: The Courts	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	4
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: Corrections	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	4
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	3
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: Organized Crime Annotations and Consultants' Papers	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	5

DSMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: Science & Technology	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	5
The Institute For Defense Analyses	Task Force Report: Narcotics and Drug Abuse	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington	1967	1
Nicholas N. Kittrie	The Deviants	American University	1968	1
Wayne R. LaFave	Arrest: The Decision to Take a Suspect into Custody	Little, Brown & Co.	1965	8
Vaughan Stapleton	Lawyer Project: Preliminary Results	Unpublished	1968	1
Vaughan Stapleton	Lawyer In The Juvenile Court Project: Second Annual Report	Unpublished	1966	1
Norman Lefstein Vaughan Stapleton	Counsel in Juvenile Courts: An Experimental Study	National Council of Juvenile Court Judges	1967	38
Norman Lefstein Vaughan Stapleton	Manual of Procedures: Boys in the Juvenile Court Project	The Research Guild	1967	10
Norman Lefstein Vaughan Stapleton	Preparation for the Field: Lawyer in the Juvenile Court Project	The Research Guild	1967	8
Donald M. McIntyre	Law Enforcement in the Metropolis	American Bar Foundation	1967	5
Hans W. Mattick (Ed.)	The Future of Imprisonment in a Free Society	St. Leonard's House	1965	1
Hans W. Mattick	The Unexamined Death	John Howard Association	1966	1
David Matza	Delinquency and Drift	John Wiley & Sons	1964	1
	Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)	U.S. Supreme Court	1966	2
	N.A.A.C.P. v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 (1963)	U.S. Supreme Court	1963	2
Donald J. Newman	Conviction: The Determination of Guilt or Innocence Without Trial	Little Brown and Co.	1966	8

SIMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
Marshall Patner	Appointed Counsel's Guide for Illinois Criminal Appeals	Callaghan and Co.	1968	1
Anthony Platt	The Administration of Justice in Crisis: Chicago, April 1968	University of Chicago	1968	3
Walter V. Schaefer Wayne R. LaFave	Standards Relating to Speedy Trial	American Bar Association	1967	1
Thorsten Sellin Marvin E. Wolfgang	The Measurement of Delinquency	John Wiley and Sons	1964	1
Rita J. Simon	The Jury and the Defense of Insanity	Little, Brown and Company	1967	1
Jerome H. Skolnick	Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society	John Wiley & Sons	1967	4
Gresham Sykes	The Society of Captives	Princeton Univ. Press	1958	1
	The Application of Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967)	U.S. Supreme Court	1967	3
	The Wolfgang Case Deposition	The State of Alabama	1967	37
Lawrence P. Tiffany Donald M. McIntyre, Jr. Daniel L. Rotenberg	Detection of Crime	Little, Brown & Company	1967	1
J. Edgar Hoover	Uniform Crime Reports, 1966	U.S. Government Printing Office Washington	1967	7
Michael Wald et al.	Interrogations in New Haven: The Impact of "Miranda"	Reprinted from the Yale Law Journal Vol. 76 (8).	1967	2
	Witherspoon v. Illinois, 389 U.S. 1035 (1968)	U.S. Supreme Court	1968	2
Hans Zeisel	Some Data on Juror Attitudes Towards Capital Punishment	University of Chicago		31

CEMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
III. Organization of the Legal Profession				
Louis Auchincloss	Powers of Attorney	Houghton Mifflin Company	1963	4
Jerome E. Carlin	Lawyers' Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar	Russell Sage Foundation	1966	6
Jerome E. Carlin	Lawyers on Their Own	Rutgers Univ. Press	1962	1
Joel F. Handler	The Lawyer and His Community	Univ. of Wisconsin Press	1967	2
Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr. (Ed.)	Law in a Changing America	Prentice-Hall, Inc.	1968	3
Howard M. Vollmer Donald L. Mills	Professionalism	Prentice-Hall, Inc.	1966	7
Seymour Warkov Joseph Zelan	Lawyers in the Making	Aldine Publishing Co.	1965	1
Joseph Zelan	Social Origins and the Recruitment of American Lawyers	NORC Reprint	1967	1
IV. Civil Procedure and the Court System				
Walter J. Blum Harry Kalven, Jr.	Public Law Perspectives on a Private Law Problem	Little, Brown and Company	1965	4
Alfred F. Conard James N. Morgan Robert W. Pratt Charles E. Voltz Robert L. Bombaugh	Automobile Accident Costs and Payments	University of Michigan Press	1964	5
Hon. John F. Dooling, Jr.	Seminar for Newly Appointed United States District Judges	Unpublished		1
Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.	Research in Civil Procedure	Walter E. Meyer Research Institute of Law	1963	4
Robert B. Hunting Gloria S. Neuwirth	Who Sues in New York City?	Columbia University Press	1962	2
Harry W. Jones	The Courts, the Public, and the Law Explosion	Prentice-Hall	1965	1

SSMILE BOOK INVENTORY (Continued)

Author	Title	Publisher	Date	Copies On Hand
Harry Kalven Hans Zeisel	The American Jury	Little, Brown and Co.	1966	2
Robert E. Keeton Jeffrey O'Connell	Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim	Little, Brown and Co.	1965	4
A. Leo Levin Edward A. Woolley	Dispatch and Delay	University of Pennsylvania	1961	3
Stewart Macaulay	Law and the Balance of Power	Russell Sage Foundation	1966	5
Walter E. Meyer Foundation	Dollars, Delay and the Automobile Victim	Bobbs-Merrill	1968	8
Maurice Rosenberg	The Pretrial Conference and Effective Justice	Columbia University Press	1964	4
H. Lawrence Ross	Negotiation in Automobile Insurance Claims	Unpublished	1968	3
Hans Zeisel	Regional Variations in Jury Awards	University of Chicago Jury Project	1968	32
Hans Zeisel	The New York Expert Testimony Project: Some Reflections on Legal Experiments	Reprinted from Stanford Law Rev.	1956	8
Hans Zeisel Thomas Callahan	Split Trials and Time Saving: A Statistical Analysis	Harvard Law Rev. Association	1963	6
Hans Zeisel Harry Kalven Bernard Buchholz	Delay in the Court	Little, Brown and Co.	1959	3
V. Civil Disorders				
Hans Mattick	Form and Content of Recent Riots	Reprinted from Midway, Vol. 9 (1)	1968	6
U.S. Riot Commission	Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders	Bantom Books	1968	1

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS
LAW AND SOCIETY ASSOCIATION

Syllabus

1969 Social Science Methods in Legal Education Institute
University of Denver College of Law
200 West 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204
July 7 - August 1, 1969

Resident Faculty:

Allen H. Barton, Ph.D. (Sociology), Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University

William M. Beaney, LL.B., Ph.D. (Political Science), Department of Politics, Princeton University (until September 1, 1969); University of Denver College of Law

Lawrence M. Friedman, LL.B., Stanford University Law School

Robert B. Yegge, M.A. (Sociology), LL.B., University of Denver College of Law

Visiting Faculty:

David H. Bayley, Ph.D. (Political Science), University of Denver Graduate School of International Relations

David Cavers, LL.B., Harvard Law School

Jack Ladinsky, Ph.D. (Sociology), University of Wisconsin

Hans Mattick, Ph.D. (Sociology), University of Chicago Law School

Alan Merson, LL.B., University of Denver College of Law

Wilbert E. Moore, Ph.D. (Sociology), Princeton University and Russell Sage Foundation

Walter F. Murphy, Ph.D. (Political Science), Princeton University, Chairman, Department of Politics

Howard I. Rosenberg, LL.B., General Counsel, Metropolitan Denver Legal Aid Society

H. Laurence Ross, Ph. D. (Sociology), University of Denver College of Law

Gresham M. Sykes, Ph. D. (Sociology), University of Denver College of Law

Kyle White, J. D., University of Denver College of Law

Advance Reading:

Gresham Sykes, Robert Sulnick, Norman Linton, Law and Social Science Research: A Collection of Annotated Readings (1969).
Kai Erickson, Wayward Puritans, New York: John Wiley & Sons (1966).
Peter Blau, Dynamics of Bureaucracy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1955).
Erving Goffman, Asylums, New York: Doubleday-Anchor Press (1961).

Morning sessions will be held daily from July 7 through August 1. They will begin at 9:00 a.m. and break at 10:30 a.m. (Part I), then resume at 11:00 a.m. and end at 12:20 p.m. (Part II). All sessions will be held in Room 202 of the University of Denver College of Law, 200 West 14th Avenue, Denver.

Participants may elect, on a voluntary basis, to attend (a) laboratory sessions (Part III), and, (b) special topical seminars, both to be held during afternoons. Laboratory sessions (Part III) will be held from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Tuesday and Thursday in the Social Science Laboratory of the Administration of Justice Program (South Basement). Topical seminars will be arranged during the first week of the Institute, which seminars will center around the research projects of participants.

I. METHODS AND CONCEPTS

Sunday, July 6

2:00 p.m. Orientation, College of Law, 200 West 14th Avenue

3:00 p.m. Depart for Yegge Peak (from College of Law)

Monday, July 7

Part I: Methods

TOPIC: TYPES OF RESEARCH DESIGN: LOGIC OF TESTING CAUSAL HYPOTHESES
Professor Barton, Discussion Leader

Reading: Sykes, et al., Law and Social Science Research: A Collection of Annotated Readings, Introduction: Author's Comments.

Suggested Reading: Sykes, et al., Law and Social Science Research: A Collection of Annotated Readings.
Chapter I: Law and Empirical Inquiry
Author's Comments
William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, "Methods in Social Research"
Chapter II: The Design of Research
Author's Comments
Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, Stuart Cook, "Research Methods"
Samuel Stouffer, "Some Observations on Study Design"

Hans Zeisel, "The Law," in The Uses of Sociology, pp. 81-99, eds. by Paul F. Lazarsfeld, William H. Sewell, and Harold L. Wilensky, New York: Basic Books, Inc. (1967).

Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, Stuart Cook, "Research Design: Testing Causal Hypotheses," in Research Methods in Social Relations, pp. 79-144, New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston (1959).

Part II: Concepts

TOPIC: DEVIANCE AND NORMS

Reading: Erickson, Wayward Puritans.

Tuesday, July 8

Part I: Methods

TOPIC: EXPERIMENTATION
Professor Ross, Discussion Leader

Reading: Donald T. Campbell and Julian Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago: Rand-McNally (1966).

Part II: Concepts

TOPIC: STRUCTURAL PRESSURES

Reading: Blau, Dynamics of Bureaucracy.

Part III: Voluntary Laboratory Session

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE LEGAL DATA

Reading: Kenneth Janda, Data Processing, Evanston: Northwestern University Press (1965).

Robert Campbell, "How the Computer Gets the Answer," Life Educational Reprint 33 (1967).

Wednesday, July 9

Part I: Methods

TOPIC: QUALITATIVE OBSERVATION
Professor Beaney and Professor Sykes, Discussion Leaders

Reading: Sykes, et al., Law and Social Science Research: A Collection of Annotated Readings.
Chapter II: The Design of Research
Jerome H. Skolnick, "Justice Without Trial"
Chapter VI: The Problem of Inference
Allen Barton & Paul Lazarsfeld, "Some Functions of Qualitative Analysis in Social Research"

Suggested Reading: Howard S. Becker, "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation," American Sociological Review (December 1958), pp. 652-660. (Bobbs-Merrill Reprint S-337).

Part II: Concepts

TOPIC: TOTAL INSTITUTIONS

Reading: Goffman, Asylums.

Thursday, July 10

Part I: Methods

TOPIC: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS
Professor Barton, Discussion Leader

Reading: T. Hirschi and H. C. Selvin, Delinquency Research, Chapters 3 to 5, pp. 37-87, New York: Macmillan (1967).

Part II: Concepts

TOPIC: FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

Suggested Reading: Seymour Lipset, Union Democracy, New York: Doubleday-Anchor Press (1956).

Part III: Voluntary Laboratory Sessions

TOPIC: FORMULATION OF QUANTIFIABLE HYPOTHESES

Friday, July 11

Part I: Methods

TOPIC: SAMPLING
Professor Barton, Discussion Leader

Reading: Sykes, et al., Law and Social Science Research: A Collection of Annotated Readings.
Chapter IV: The Problem of Sampling
John H. Mueller & Karl F. Schuessler, "Statistical Reasoning in Sociology"

Suggested Reading: Selltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations, pp. 509-545.

Lipset, Union Democracy.

Samuel Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith (1963).

Jerome Carlin, Lawyers' Ethics, New York: Russell Sage Foundation (1966).

TOPIC: SCALING AND MEASUREMENT
Professor Barton, Discussion Leader

Reading. Selltiz, et al., "Some General Problems of Measurement," in Research Methods in Social Relations, Chapter 5.

Suggested Reading: Selltiz, et al., ibid., Chapter 10.

S. S. Stevens, "On the Theory of Scales of Measurement," Bobbs Merrill Reprint S-515.

Lipset, Union Democracy. Appendix C. pp. 432-438.

Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties, Appendix C, pp. 262-269.

Carlin, Lawyers' Ethics, Appendices B and C, pp. 194-214.

Part II: Concepts

TOPIC: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEGAL EDUCATION
Professors Yegge, Sykes, Friedman and Beaney, Discussion Leaders

II. ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Suggested Reading for Sessions on Administration of Justice

Harry Kalven and Hans Zeisel, The American Jury, Boston: Little, Brown & Co. (1966).

Jerome Carlin, Lawyers' Ethics.

Erwin Smigel, Wall Street Lawyer, New York: Macmillan (1964).

Joel Handler, The Lawyer in His Community, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press (1967).

Monday, July 14

TOPIC: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS
Professor Murphy, Discussion Leader

(a) Systems Analysis

(b) Role Theory

Reading: Kenneth Dolbeare, Trial Courts in Urban Politics, New York: John Wiley & Sons (1967).

W. J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, pp. 483-496.

Neal C. Gross and others, Explorations in Role Analysis, Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 7. New York: John Wiley & Sons (1958).

Tuesday, July 15

TOPIC: APPLICATION OF THEORY TO COURTS
Professors Murphy and Beaney, Discussion Leaders

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

Reading: Walter F. Murphy, Elements of Judicial Strategy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1964).

Glendon A. Schubert, Judicial Decision-Making, New York: Macmillan (1963).

VOLUNTARY LABORATORY SESSION: SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION

Wednesday, July 16

TOPIC: THE LEGAL PROFESSION
Professor Moore, Discussion Leader

Reading: Abraham Blumberg, "Practice of Law as a Confidence Game," Law and Society Review, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 15-39.

Thursday, July 17 and Friday, July 18

TOPIC: LAW ENFORCEMENT
Professor Bayley, Discussion Leader

Reading: Kenneth C. Davis, Discretionary Justice, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press (1969).

David Bayley and Harold Mendelsohn, Minorities and the Police, New York: Macmillan (1969).

TOPIC: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEGAL EDUCATION

III. PROBLEMS OF THE URBAN GHETTO

Monday, July 21

TOPIC: GHETTO AS COMMUNITY: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Reading: Lee Rainwater & William Yancey, The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy, Cambridge: M. I. T. Press (1967).

Elliott Liebow, Tally's Corner, Boston: Little, Brown & Co. (1967).

David Caplovitz, The Poor Pay More, New York: Macmillan (1963).

Gerald Suttles, Social Order of the Slum, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1968).

Suggested Reading: Abram Kardiner and Lionel Oversey, The Mark of Oppression, New York: Norton (1951). Reprint Gloucester: Peter Smith.

Stanley Elkins, Slavery, New York: Grosset & Dunlap (1963).

William Foote Whyte, Street Corner Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1955).

Tuesday, July 22 and Wednesday, July 23

TOPIC: SOLUTIONS AND THEIR EVALUATION

(a) Social Services

Reading: Headstart Report

Walter B. Miller, "The Impact of a Total Community Delinquency Control Project," Social Problems, Vol. 10 (Fall 1962), pp. 168-190.

Henry Meyers and Edgar Borgotta, Girls at Vocational High, New York: Russell Sage Foundation (1965).

(b) Infusion of Money

Reading: Christopher Green, Negative Taxes and the Poverty Problem, Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institute (1967).

(c) Power

Reading: Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, New York: Macmillan (1969).

Peter Marris and Martin Rein, Dilemmas of Social Reform, New York: Atherton Press (1967).

Gresham M. Sykes, "Legal Needs of the Poor in Denver," (1966).

Guests: Professor David Cavers
Professor Jack Ladinsky
Howard I. Rosenberg, Esq.
Professor Gresham M. Sykes

Thursday, July 24 and Friday, July 25

TOPIC: POLITICAL DYNAMICS OF GHETTO PROBLEMS

Reading: Allen H. Barton, Communities in Disaster, Chap. V, Garden City: Doubleday (1969).

Lawrence Friedman, Government and Slum Housing, Chicago: Rand McNally (1968).

Rainwater & Yancey, The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy.

TOPIC: RESPONSE TO THE GHETTO BY THE DOMINANTS

Reading: National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Hazel G. Erskine, "Demonstrations and Race Riots," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 31 (Winter 1967-68), pp. 655-677.

TOPIC: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEGAL EDUCATION

Guests: Professor Alan Merson
Kyle White, Esq.

IV. DISSENT

Monday, July 28

TOPIC: GHETTO RIOTS

Reading: U. S. Riot Commission, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, New York: Bantam Books (1968).

David J. Bordua, The Police, New York: John Wiley & Sons (1967).
Chapter I: Allan Silver, "The Demand for Order in Civil Society: A Review of Some Themes in the History of Urban Crime, Police and Riot"

Guest: Professor Hans Mattick

Tuesday, July 29

TOPIC: CAMPUS RIOTS

Reading: Seymour M. Lipset and Sheldon Wolin, Berkeley Student Revolt, New York: Doubleday-Anchor Press (1965).

Louis Massoti, "Editor's Preface," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. II, No. 4 (1968).

Daniel Walker, Rights in Conflict (Report to the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence), New York: Bantam (1968).

Allen H. Barton, "The Columbia Crisis," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 32 (Fall 1968), pp. 333-351.

Wednesday, July 30

TOPIC: ANOMIE

Reading: Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 131-160, Macmillan (1957).

Thursday, July 31

TOPIC: PUBLIC REACTION

Reading: Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties.

Walter Blum and Harry Kalven, Jr., "The Art of Opinion Research," 24 University of Chicago Review, page 1 (1956).

Arthur Waskow, From Race Riot to Sit-In, New York: Doubleday-Anchor Press (1967).

Friday, August 1

TOPIC: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEGAL EDUCATION